## THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

MICHAEL DAVID SILLS )	
and MARY SILLS,	
)	
Plaintiffs,	
)	CASE NO. 3:23-cv-00478
v. )	
)	JUDGE WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR
)	Magistrate Judge Chip Frensley
<b>SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION, )</b>	
et al.	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendants.	

## <u>DEFENDANT JENNIFER LYELL'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'</u> MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Plaintiffs Michael David Sills and Mary Sills seek a broad protective order in this case to limit, or prevent the use or disclosure of any and all documents or testimony any party may choose to stamp as "confidential" (Doc. 132). Defendant Lyell opposes the entry of such an overly broad order at this time as premature and unnecessary.

Defendant Lyell still has pending a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Claims based upon the ecclesiastical abstention doctrine, applicable statutes of limitation and the failure of the Plaintiffs to state a valid claim for defamation and other claimed causes of action (Doc. Nos. 75, 76). Although the Magistrate Judge denied the Motions filed by Defendant Lyell (and other Defendants) to stay discovery pending the resolution of their motions to dismiss, Defendant Lyell has objected to that recommended denial of the stay (Doc. No. 125). That objection is still pending before the District Court Judge.

In support of their Motion for Protective Order, Plaintiffs claim the "various defendants" have made "false and very public allegations of sexual abuse and/or sexual assault by Plaintiff

David Sills," citing their own Complaint. Motion at 1. Yet, sadly, the findings of abuse by Mr. Sills are not "false," but have been true. Nevertheless, Plaintiffs continue to bristle at any questioning of the narrative they put before the public in the "false and very public allegations" of their Complaint. Plaintiffs now wish to cloak in secrecy the judicial process they themselves initiated in attempt to discredit the internal church investigation that the Defendant Guidepost Solutions conducted.

The protective order Plaintiffs seek is an overly broad, blanket protective order that would be subject to abuse and over-designating. In Plaintiffs' Responses to Interrogatories propounded by two different Defendants, Plaintiffs have designated every page containing a response as "confidential" or "highly confidential." 1

Plaintiffs have not made the showing necessary to obtain such a broad protective order. If a protective order relates to the discovery stage, a district court may enter a protective order limiting the use of discovery materials upon a showing of "good cause." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). If the protective order seeks to keep trial materials and pleadings filed with the Court secret or under seal, the burden of overcoming the presumption of openness of such records is much greater. E.g., Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. F.T.C., 710 F.2d 1165 (6th Cir. 1983); In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co., 723 F. 2d 470 (6th Cir. 1983). By its terms, Plaintiffs' proposed Protective Order does not apply to the discovery phase only, but rather states that it includes the "trial of this case." Proposed Order at 1. Plaintiffs have not shown "good cause" for their proposed restrictions on disclosure and certainly have not met the heavy burden for sealing judicial records beyond the discovery stage.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Because such discovery responses are not filed and because of Plaintiffs' claim of confidentiality filed, Defendant Lyell has not filed those responses as exhibits to this pleading, but can do so as a late exhibit if Plaintiffs deny this statement regarding their blanket confidentiality designations to date.

Defendant Lyell supports a limited protective order that would protect sensitive personal information such as telephone numbers, addresses, email addresses, social security numbers, names of employers, medical records, and private banking information. Lyell would not oppose a protective order that would protect the identity of non-party witnesses with knowledge of Mr. Sills' conduct with other persons and his reputation, which he claims was damaged by the Defendant Southern Baptist Convention's investigation and the Defendant Guidepost Solutions LLC's report.

Defendant Lyell respectfully asks that this Court not enter the Plaintiffs' proposed broad protective order at this time. If discovery is allowed to proceed, Defendant Lyell asks the Court to enter a more specifically tailored protective order to govern discovery in this matter, along the lines set forth in the preceding paragraph, or to simply direct the parties to seek agreement, or the Court's guidance if agreement cannot be reached, as to the need for confidentiality of specific items of information as the issue may arise.

Respectfully submitted,

## **NEAL & HARWELL, PLC**

By: /s/ Philip N. Elbert

Philip N. Elbert, BPR #009430

Ronald G. Harris, BPR #009054

Olivia R. Arboneaux, BPR #040225

1201 Demonbreun Street, Suite 1000

Nashville, Tennessee 37203

(615) 244-1713 – Phone

(615) 726-0573 – Fax

pelbert@nealharwell.com

rharris@nealharwell.com

oarboneaux@nealharwell.com

Counsel for Defendant Jennifer Lyell

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 1st day of March, 2024, the foregoing was served via the court's electronic filing system and/or by email on the following counsel of record:

Gary E. Brewer Brewer and Terry, PC 1702 W. Andrew Johnson Hwy. P.O. Box 2046 Morristown, TN 37816 robin@brewerandterry.com

John W. ("Don") Barrett (pro hac vice) Katherine Barrett Riley (pro hac vice) Sarah Sterling Aldridge (pro hac vice) BARRETT LAW GROUP, PA P.O. Box 927 404 Court Square North Lexington, MS 39095 dbarrett@barrettlawgroup.com kbriley@barrettlawgroup.com saldridge@barrettlawgroup.com

Shannon M. McNulty (pro hac vice) CLIFFORD LAW OFFICES, PC 120 N. LaSalle St., 36th Floor Chicago, IL 60602 smm@cliffordlaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

L. Gino Marchetti, Jr. Matthew C. Pietsch TAYLOR, PIGUE, MARCHETTI & BLAIR, PLLC 2908 Poston Avenue Nashville, TN 37203 gmarchetti@tpmblaw.com matt@tpmblaw.com

Counsel for Defendants Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. Ed Litton, and Dr. Bart Barber

John R. Jacobson Katharine R. Klein RILEY & JACOBSON, PLC 1906 West End Ave. Nashville, TN 37203 jjacobson@rjfirm.com kklein@rifirm.com

Steven G. Mintz (pro hac vice) Terence W. McCormick (pro hac vice) MINTZ & GOLD LLP 600 Third Avenue, 25th Floor New York, NY 10016 mintz@mintzandgold.com mccormick@mintzandgold.com

Counsel for Defendants Guidepost Solutions LLC and SolutionPoint International, Inc.

Catherine M. Newman R. Bruce Barze, Jr. (pro hac vice) BARZE TAYLOR NOLES LOWTHER LLC 2204 Lakeshore Dr., Suite 425 Birmingham, AL 35209 cnewman@btnllaw.com bbarze@btnllaw.com

Counsel for Defendant Eric Geiger

George H. Cate, III Kimberly M. Ingram-Hogan BRADLEY ARANT BOULT CUMMINGS LLP ONE 22 ONE 1221 Broadway, Suite 2400 Nashville, TN 37203 gcate@bradlev.com kingram@bradley.com

Richard C. Mangelsdorf, Jr. Terri L. Bernal McAngus Goudelock & Courie, LLC P.O. Box 2949 120 Brentwood Commons Way, Suite 625 Brentwood, TN 37024 chuck.mangelsdorf@mgclaw.com terri.bernal@mgclaw.com

Counsel for Defendant LifeWay Christian Resources of the Southern Baptist Convention

Brigid M. Carpenter Ryan P. Loofbourrow BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN, CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, PC 1600 West End Avenue, Suite 2000 Nashville, Tennessee 37203 bcarpenter@bakerdonelson.com rloofbourrow@bakerdonelson.com

Counsel for Defendants The Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention, Willie McLaurin, and Rolland Slade

James C. Bradshaw III WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP 333 Commerce Street, Suite 1050 Nashville, TN 37201 jbradshaw@wyattfirm.com

Byron Leet (pro hac vice) WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP 400 West Market Street, Suite 2000 Louisville, KY 40202 bleet@wyattfirm.com

Thomas E. Travis (pro hac vice) WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP 250 West Main Street, Suite 1600 Lexington, KY 40507 ttravis@wyattfirm.com

Counsel for Defendants The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and Dr. R. Albert Mohler

/s/ Philip N. Elbert\_\_